

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

July 7, 2016

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman David Scott Meade, Craig Krueger, Henry Liu and Kevin Sutton.

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Renard Mun and Zoi Karagouni

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee and Steven Fischer, Redmond Planning

RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Trapp *with* Lady of Letters, Inc.

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Chairman Meade at 7:04 p.m.

MINUTES REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER, SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 16, 2016 MEETING. MOTION CARRIED (3-0 WITH 1 ABSTENTION)

APPROVAL

LAND-2016-01140, Downtown Park

Description: The proposed Downtown Park is a City owned 2.2 acre park comprised of a raised lawn with wood decking, decorative scored cement concrete surfaces, seating walls, landscaped bosques and allees, water features such as a splash pad and water wall with a digital pavilion, restroom facilities, and gathering/event spaces for the Redmond community and visitors at large

Location: From Redmond Way to Cleveland Street & 161st Ave NE to the Stone House

Contact: Lisa Singer *with* City of Redmond

Prior Review Date: 02/18/16

Staff Contact: Gary Lee, 425-556-2418, glee@redmond.gov

Mr. Fischer stated that this project was presented to the review board in February 2016. Items that were suggested for revision or upgrade are outlined in the staff memo. Those items included seating, wheelchair accessibility, child safety and lighting. Staff is recommending approval of the updated plans for building elevations, colors, materials, lighting and landscaping plans for this project with the standard presentation materials and inconsistencies.

Redmond Planning gave a brief overview of the park, how it is going to function and the changes that have been made. This is intended to be a vibrant, urban park for all the residents that will live and work in downtown Redmond as well as all the citizens. The community was engaged to help design this park to meet the desire of the people. The project is in the 90% design phase of planning and construction is scheduled to begin in this summer for grading and structural fill material that will support the park. The park itself will be under construction in early 2017 with a scheduled opening in 2018.

The chairperson of the Parks and Trails Commission and has been involved with this project since the beginning. The public was given several visions for the park from different consultants and voted for the selection of the consultant of the park. A series of public meetings were held to decide what the public wanted to see in this project and this feedback was taken into consideration when setting the vision for the park. The programming for the park is arranged so that everyone can enjoy the experience from public events to passive enjoyment.

Ms. Sanders stated that vision for the park was to create an extraordinary gathering place where art and park are indistinguishable. The current design has stayed true to the master plan with a few tweaks. The consultant team wanted to bring technology and the nature area together in this plan and this is reflected in the design.

Pictured on the right side of this slide is the iconic water feature, which is currently in full scale mock-up, to ensure that the water feature and the lighting will work as designed. The splash pond is in response to the public's wishes to have a water play area for the children. It has lots of close seating which will serve to contain the children in the area and provide good sight for the parents to watch their children. Shade trees are provided except over the great lawn. The wood ring that encircled the great lawn is raised which will provide additional seating.

Shown was a working sample of the lighting for the back side of the restroom building which is intended to glow at night and is adjustable.

Ms. Sanders said that once the bids on the park are opened, there may have to be a switch from concrete pavers to colored concrete, depending on cost.

It was stated that the restroom building serves also as an accessory park building for maintenance and has a small media room to control the performances at the pavilion. The pumps for the splash pad and the water feature are housed there as well. To tie it in with the park design, IPE cladding is used on the brow and is similar to what is used to encircle the great lawn. Although this is a functional building the materials used on the exterior where chosen to blend with the art piece. The back of the building is illuminated translucent aluminum which will have a soft glow and provide light and signage to that corner of the park.

There has been increase in the screening view into the restrooms and the IPE brow was extended to include all doors. Only the restroom doors will be painted grey to give some extra attention to them and a not a bright color as shown before. An additional viewing window has been added to the media room which was not included in previous iterations.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Feels all the comments from the last meeting have been responded to very well.
- Was curious to know about street closures during events. Ms. Sanders responded that was addressed in the transportation report.

Mr. Liu:

- Feels the privacy sight line to the restrooms could have been handled with a screened wall instead of a larger partition so the doors do not open directly to the park. The larger partitions may make the rooms feel smaller. Ms. Sanders stated that screen walls were discussed but it was felt those would be more of a barrier. Ms. Fischer said that the team felt creating separate partitions may provide places for people to hide or linger which could a problem.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked about the view of the park from the buildings that will surround it. Ms. Fischer responded that the roof is a white membrane product with 4 small air units and there is a parapet around the roof. Most views will see shade trees and the higher residential units will not even see the building.

A discussion about the line of sight and privacy for the restrooms was had and the conclusion was to have the project and designer work with staff to find a resolution for this item

MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER TO APPROVE LAND 2016-01140 DOWNTOWN PARK WITH ALL THE STANDARDS AND INCONSISTENCIES AND EXPLORE WITH STAFF A RESOLUTION TO THE PRIVACY ISSUE WITH THE RESTROOMS WHICH STAFF CAN BRING BEFORE THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL, SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

APPROVAL

LAND-2016-00279, Esterra Park Apartments, Blocks 5, 6A, 9

Description: 3 buildings with approximately 661 residential units

Location: TBD (parcel number: 0673100050)

Contact: Scott Clark with Clark Design Group, LLC

Prior Review Dates: 05/05/16 & 06/16/16

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2462, dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee indicated a change was made to the staff memo on this project concerning the courtyard changing from an open concept to more of a closed concept. This is important because it discourages the use of the pedestrian pathway that is right behind this area. Pedestrian access is the key cornerstone of the master plan and vision within the Esterra Park area. The pathway serves to connect people to transportation, parks and urban trails. The fence on top of the landscaping wall gives it more of an enclosed feel and is not welcoming. Staff recommends approval; however, to remand the courtyard to staff to better implement the master plan or direct the application to bring a modified plan back to the next available DRB for approval.

Mr. Clark stated that the team has brought the 3D digital model with them. Some the ideas that were discussed at the last DRB meeting had to do with the corner of building 6A and Turning Street, the pedestrian experience, breaking up some of the concrete walls primarily the south side. On building B, the main focus was the concrete wall along Graham and finding ways to open up the transparency of building on the corner of Graham and 26th. Building A needed to differentiate the top space, create some variation there and upgrading the pedestrian experience there as well.

In the packets, there are pictures comparing the differences in the meeting of DRB 2 to the changes brought forward here tonight, like before and after pictures. The base of 6A has been opened up and reinforces the activity at the bus stop. The corner is dramatically different from the last iteration. There are now bays along the brick façade. This building steps down and the office building that will be erected in the next block with step down in the same fashion. Also, there will be some landscaping on the top of the brick cornice which creates a nice feature and will grow down on the brick.

On most of the concrete walls on all the buildings that needed it, the landscaping has been bermmed up to the walls in steps so to speak, leaving lots of green area which people can sit and picnic or enjoy the outdoors.

Mr. Sacs stated that the fencing is forty-two inches high and is acting as a gateway to the entrance to the plaza.

Mr. Brumbaugh showed the overall landscape plan. The plaza space has been developed more since the last iteration.

Mr. Clark showed several more views of the buildings and the outdoor spaces including the bicycle parking. More accent colors have been added to the project and there are now balconies on the top floors. He feels these changes are very successful and the pedestrian experience will be improved. He presented the materials board to the board.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Asked about the easement marked in yellow in the plans; is that a public easement? Mr. Lee stated that it was a public pedestrian easement which is required to be thirty feet wide.
- Thinks that the access looks much narrower than thirty feet and feels closed off.

Mr. Brumbaugh stated that the main issue is security for the residents, but would like to have the option to discuss this with staff and find a solution to pedestrian walkway and security. There are no retail spaces here, so there are fewer reasons to use this area. There is no crosswalk at this location.

Mr. Meade suggested opening up the entrance to be as wide as the stairs and will feel like a connection to the area. Mr. Brumbaugh said that the other issue with the walkway is there is a significant grade fall on Turing so to build a walkway would difficult without causing a significant warp to it. Mr. Lee said the City's main concern is getting more of an open feel. The entrance and exit should be a prominent feature in terms of ease of access.

Mr. Clark stated that site plan shows a pedestrian walkway and the project supplies half of the thirty foot dedication as required; the narrowest point is thirty two feet. Mr. Brumbaugh restated there is no mid-block crosswalk for safety issues.

Mr. Meade asked about the railing or fence and does it need to be totally removed. Mr. Lee said it does not all have to be removed, but there should be clearance of about five or ten feet around the pathway that leads to the stairs. The board members and the applicant's representatives continued to discuss the railing issue.

Mr. Krueger:

- On page 19 and 20, he feels would be an opportunity to do something really different with that corner as opposed to being a passive open space. Mr. Brumbaugh said that the thought was to make this space more of a pastoral feel that will match what is across the street on the Avalon project. There will some landscaped terraced walls to give that area more structure.

Mr. Liu:

- He appreciates all the work that has gone into this project and the improvements made.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked for more information on the materials used on the amenity space at the top of the building. Mr. Clark said it is metal on the outside, but inside it has a heavy timber structure with exposed car decking. Then there is a series of roof lines and eaves which provides some cover.

MOVED BY MR. LIU TO APPROVE LAND 2016-00279 ESTERRA PARK APARTMENTS BLOCK 5,6A AND 9 WITH ALL STANDARD CONDITIONS AND INCONSISTENCIES, AND EXPLORE WITH STAFF A RESOLUTION ON OPENING UP THE COURTYARD TO ADDRESS STAFF'S COMMENTS AND

BRING BEFORE THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL, SECONDED BY MR. SUTTON. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2016-00239, AVA at Esterra Park Block 8

Description: The proposed project is for a 330-unit, 479,350 square foot, and multi-family project set within Block 8 of the Esterra Park/Capstone/Group Health development

Location: TBD pending review by City of Redmond, parcel number: 0673100050

Contact: Arpita Mitra *with* Ankrom Moisan Architects

Prior Review Date: 03/03/16

Staff Contact: David Lee, 425-556-2418, dlee@redmond.gov

Mr. Lee said this is the second meeting for this project.

Mr. Rasmussen stated that they have made significant progress; however, there is some additional fine tuning to be done.

Mr. Murandi showed various slides of the surrounding neighbor. This is a hub and cluster concept that refers to the context of the technology industry in the area. The residential units are in different clusters and those are expressed in the massing. They are requesting two departures; one is the ten foot deep modulation requirement and second is to use fiber cement material in the siding.

Mr. Brumbaugh said the landscaping shows how it relates to the park across the street.

Mr. Kelley stated that each façade has been addressed in a unique way and showed slides to detail those differences. There are some apartments with stoops while some have private patios. Parking is screened and below ground for the majority of the project.

Mr. Murandi said that the building does meet the zoning code. There is actually more modulation than what is required by the code by using different strategies. Those approaches are setting the building back from the property line, using stacked balconies and applying material changes that correspond to the building mass.

He showed the sunlight study for the buildings. The northwest corner was shifted to give better access to the courtyard. There will be some benches in front of the building as well as a mosaic art piece feature and more landscaping. There will be a fitness area and amenity space.

The rendering shows the pedestrian pathway with hammerheads on each end of the street and drivable surface in between. The east façade has been set back about twenty feet which provides access for air and light for the units. The ground floor units have private patios. There is a proposed sitting patio on the northeast corner of Turning Street.

The external materials proposed are Nichiha panels used in combination with a vertical metal panel. The Nichiha product information states there is a 50 year warranty on the panels and a 15 year warranty on the finish. Also, proposed is to use three different colors of premium fiber cement panel to highlight the window articulation and show creative use of this material. A material board was presented showing the colors and materials.

Mr. Brumbaugh showed the pastoral landscape from the other side of Graham Street. There is a twenty feet grade fall from Graham down to the stair. They will be terracing down that slope with some small outlook patios. In the courtyard, the geometry has changed a bit to relate to the layout of the building.

The board agreed to the proposed departures requested.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Krueger:

- Felt the landscaping and the articulation of the project was good.
- Thinks there is a lot of metal paneling and wondered if the entire cement paneling is the same around the project. Mr. Murandi said there are different ways the materials will be applied and size which will make it appear as different material.
- Asked if the yellow backdrop is the same pattern as well. Mr. Murandi replied that it is different as that is a hardy panel system. Each cluster has a different look.
- Feels the corners should be darker to have more definition.

Mr. Liu:

- Asked about the warranty on these panels. Mr. Murandi stated the warranty is twenty-five years and that the colors are factory applied which provides more durability.

Mr. Sutton:

- Asked if the entries and edges will have lighting. Mr. Murandi answered that those areas with have lighting.

Mr. Meade:

- Feels the project is ready for approval at the next meeting.

DRB Members

- Overall consensus that project should be brought back for approval

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. KRUEGER AND SECONDED BY MR. LIU TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:21 P.M. MOTION APPROVED (4-0).

August 18, 2016
MINUTES APPROVED ON


RECORDING SECRETARY